

REMARKS

Claims 1, 4-9, and 20-33 are pending and stand rejected. Claims 1, 20, and 23 are amended. No claim is added or canceled. Claims 1, 4-9, and 20-33 are pending upon entry of this amendment. Applicants thank the Examiner for examination of the claims pending in this application and address the Examiner's comments below.

Response to Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

All pending claims were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,058,417 to Hess et al. ("Hess") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,982,369 to Sciammarella et al. ("Sciammarella") in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,271,840 to Finseth et al. ("Finseth"). This rejection is now traversed in view of the above amendment.

Independent claim 31 recites, inter alia, the following:

...

- obtaining a user generated product search query for relevant products, together with a first user selection of a selected output format from a plurality of output formats and a second user selection of a selected cue from a plurality of cues;

- performing the product search query for relevant products, the performing being done in response to obtaining the product search query, the first user selection, and the second user selection;

- obtaining search results that reference a set of products determined to be responsive to the product search query, the set of products being associated with the plurality of cues; and

- outputting instructions for displaying the selected cue of the set of products on a search result page in an order corresponding to a relevance ranking and in the selected output format according to the first user selection and the second user selection, wherein the plurality of output formats includes a grid view and a list view, wherein the grid view is comprised of a plurality of cells, and each cell displaying information corresponding to the selected cue of one product.

The applied references, Hess, Sciammarella, and Finseth, either alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest the following claim limitations: (1) “performing the product search query for relevant products, the performing being done in response to obtaining the product search query, the first user selection, and the second user selection”, and (2) “outputting instructions for displaying the selected cue of the set of products on a search result page ... in the selected output format according to the first user selection and the second user selection”.

Hess, in contrast, discloses a system for displaying auditing items in a list view or in a gallery view. See Hess, col. 5, lines 3-24 (5:3-24), and Figures 1 and 9A. A user can switch between the two views by clicking a text mode button and a photo mode button displayed on the search result page. See Hess at 9:49-53 and Figure 9A. Unlike the above-cited claim limitation (1), the Hess system does not perform a query in response to obtaining user selections of an output format and a cue. In Hess, a user can only select a display view after the query result is generated and displayed (i.e., by clicking buttons on the search result display page). Also, in Hess a user cannot specify what cue of auction items to be displayed in the display page. The user can only select an output format (i.e., a list view or a gallery view) in Hess, and cannot select what cue of the matching auction items to be displayed in the output format. Thus, the Hess reference also does not disclose outputting instructions for displaying the user selected cue of matching products in the search result page as recited in claim limitation (2).

The Examiner cited 2:23-27 and 9:46-63 of Hess for teaching claim limitation (1) and Figures 8 and 9, 8:61-67 and 9:1-63 for teaching claim limitation (2). Hess at 2:23-27 describes that the Hess system displays thumbnail images for matching items in response to a

user query. Figure 8 of Hess and the corresponding description at 8:61-9:45 describe an item presentation process that inserts database result into a predefined page format on the fly, and state that representing thumbnail images in the search result using image file names can cause the images to be cached and thus improve efficiency. Figures 9A-B of Hess and corresponding description at 9:46-63 describe a gallery presentation format that includes a text mode button and a photo mode button allowing the user to switch between two result presentation formats. The cited sections and figures, like the rest of Hess, are silent about performing a search query “in response to obtaining the product search query, the first user selection, and the second user selection” and outputting instructions for displaying on a search result page a cue obtained together with the underlying search query.

Sciammarella similarly fails to disclose the claim limitations not taught by Hess. Sciammarella teaches a method of displaying image search results. See Sciammarella, Abstract. The sizes of the images in the search results correspond to the images’ match values (i.e., an image corresponding to a high match value is displayed in a large size). The Examiner cited Sciammarella to disclose displaying information representing search results in an order corresponding to a relevance ranking, and does not assert that Sciammarella teaches claim limitations (1) and (2).

Finseth similarly fails to disclose the claim limitations not taught by Hess and Sciammarella. Finseth teaches a method for providing graphical outputs from search engine results. See Finseth, Abstract. The Examiner cited 9:20-10:30 of Finseth for teaching “together with a first user selection of a selected output format from a plurality of output formats and a second user selection of a selected cue from a plurality of cues”. Finseth at 9:20-10:30 describes several output formats (Figures 6-8), and notes that the rendered images

in the output are subject to resizing and moving according to user preferences (10:24-28). Resizing and moving images in a search result occur after the images are rendered in the search result. In addition, Finseth is silent about a user selection of an individual cue to be included in the search result.

In view of the above, Hess, Sciammarella, and Finseth, whether considered individually or in combination, fail to disclose each and every limitation recited in independent claim 31. Thus, independent claim 31 is patentable over the cited references. Claims 32 and 33 are dependent on claim 31 and are allowable for at least the same reasons.

Independent claims 1, 20, and 23 are amended to recite additional claim features, and are patentable over the cited references for at least the same reasons as claim 31. Their dependent claims are allowable for at least the same reasons. Accordingly, withdrawal of the § 103 rejections is respectfully requested.

Independent claim 31 is not amended herein. Therefore, no new ground of rejection for it has been made necessary by Applicants. Pursuant to MPEP § 706.07(a), the Examiner shall not make the next action final if a new ground of rejection for independent claim 31 is introduced.

In conclusion, Applicants submit that the claims as amended are patentable over the cited reference and request that the application be allowed. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone in order to advance the prosecution of this case.

Respectfully Submitted,

Dated: July 20, 2010

/Jie Zhang/
Jie Zhang, Reg. No. 60,242
Attorney for Applicants
Fenwick & West LLP
801 California Street
Mountain View, CA 94041
Tel.: (650) 335-7297
Fax: (650) 938-5200